1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

to keep on friendly terms with the other members of the sympathy-group, and I shall refer to it as the Sympathetic Sanction. This considerateness is constantly evinced in daily life, e.g. by a reticence regarding the peculiarities of one's neighbours, by an absence of any cruel competitive spirit by which one man seeks profit at another's expense, even by the reluctance to exercise compulsion on another individual; and I believe that the common regard for property rights is supported by this sanction more strongly than by the fear of retaliation or of public censure, which are rather in the nature of reinforcements; for Orokaiva property, for instance, is nearly always safe from the thief even when he is absolutely free from the risk of detection, and I believe he respects it primarily out of consideration for its owner.

But it is from the negative instances that we may most safely deduce the value of the sympathetic sanction; that is to say, when the sanction has failed to work and some personal offence has been committed, we may observe the psychological effect upon the offender. In such an event the offender is amply punished by being thoroughly sorry for his victim and thoroughly ashamed of himself. We may consider a simple instance (though in our eyes a somewhat extraordinary one), viz. when a man inadvertently uses the name of his brother-in-law, which the Orokaiva regards as a very grave insult. The unfortunate offender will throw his hands up with a despairing gesture and hang his head in shame and confusion which are truly comical to behold; while the brother-in-law, if he chance to have overheard, will be deeply offended and, strangely enough, covered with equal shame. The matter can only be mended by a gift.

The conciliatory gift is a characteristic way of compensating for personal wrong. In a case previously referred to (p. 186), where a man had given a youth some feathers to wear before his formal investiture with the *kokumbari*, and

for the feelings of others, I think that the statement is generally true of the Papuan' (Sir Hubert Murray, *Papua of To-day*, p. 223). Upon looking up this passage I was so struck by its appositeness to the present chapter, that I suspect it must have had something to do with shaping the general views expressed therein, more indeed than I realised when writing.